#### STATE OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE

THREE EMPIRE STATE PLAZA, ALBANY, NY 12223-1350

Internet Address: http://www.dps.state.ny.us

#### PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

MAURREN O. HELMER Chairman

THOMAS J. DUNLBAVY TAMES D. BENNETT



#### DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

LAWRENCE G. MALONE General Counsel

LOCALIAND POOL JOHN C. CRARY Secretary

Hon. Magalie Roman Salas Secretary Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222 Washington, D.C. 20554

> Re: Docket DA 98-682 - MCI Petition of Declaratory Ruling

CC Docket No. 96-45

Dear Ms. Salas:

Enclosed are an original and six (6) copies of the Motion to Accept Late-Filed Comments in Opposition, and the Opposition of the New York State Department of Public Service in the above docket. Please date stamp and return one copy of the enclosed self-addressed envelope. We are filing these comments on diskette to Sheryl Todd of the Common Carrier Bureau.

We respectfully request that, pursuant to Sections 1.46 and 1.727, you consider the late filed comments in opposition.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (518) 474-1585. Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Penny Rubin

Managing Attorney

Enclosures

cc: MCI Communications

Misc.98:avy:Salas

No. of Copies rec'd

List ABCDE

## BEFORE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON D.C. 20554

In the Matter of:

Petition for Declaratory Ruling )
That Carriers May Assess Interstate)
Customers an Interstate Universal )
Service Charge Which is Based on )
Total Revenues

DA 98-682 CC Docket No. 96-45

119 1 8 109R

## NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE MOTION TO ACCEPT LATE-FILED COMMENTS.

The New York State Department of Public Service

(NYDPS), pursuant to sections 1.46 and 1.727 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR sections 1.46, 1.727, hereby moves the Commission to accept NYDPS' comments to MCI's Petition for a Declaratory Ruling in the above captioned matter. The grounds for this motion are as follows:

- 1. On April 24, 1998 the Commission established a pleading cycle for MCI's Petition for Declaratory Ruling.
  - MCI did not serve this Petition on the NYDPS.
- 3. Until very recently New York had no reasons to believe that MCI would seek to apply a Federal Universal Service Fee surcharge on intrastate calls made by its customers in New York State.
- 4. As a result of recent communications with MCI, we learned that MCI is imposing this surcharge on New York ratepayers.

- 5. Therefore, the NYDPS now has a direct stake in the outcome of this proceeding.
  - 6. Acceptance of this late filing will not prejudice MCI.
- 7. Accordingly, NYDPS moves that the Commission accept its late-filed comments in opposition to MCI's petition for a declaratory ruling.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence G. Malone General Counsel

New York State Department of Public Service

Paurin DM alon

Three Empire State Plaza Albany, New York 12223-1350

Dated: June 17, 1998 Albany, New York

### BEFORE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON D.C. 20554

In the Matter of:

DA 98-682 CC Docket No. 96-45

Petition for Declaratory Ruling )
That Carriers May Assess Interstate)
Customers an Interstate Universal )
Service Charge Which is Based on )
Total Revenues )

## OPPOSITION OF THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE

On April 3, 1998, MCI filed a Petition for Declaratory Ruling requesting that the Federal Communications Commission (the Commission) rule that "carriers are not precluded by the Universal Service Order from imposing a charge on interstate customers that is based on the customers total billed revenues, including intrastate revenues, to recover federal universal service costs." (Petition, p.1) The Petition should be denied for these reasons.

First, the Commission has already ordered carriers to recover their universal service contributions based only upon interstate usage. Second, MCI is seeking a change to the rules set forth in the Universal Service Order. As such, the petition is untimely and should be denied. Finally, MCI's petition seeks to require the Commission to exercise authority over intrastate

Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Report and Order, CC Docket 96-45, FCC 97-157, 12 FCC Rcd 8776 (May 8, 1997) (Universal Service Order).

communications, an area specifically reserved to the states under Section 152(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the 1996 Telecommunications Act (Section 152(b)).

# MCI'S REQUEST SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE THE UNIVERSAL SERVICE ORDER CALLS FOR CARRIERS TO RECOVER THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE FEDERAL UNIVERSAL SERVICE PROGRAM ONLY THROUGH RATES FOR INTERSTATE USAGE

The Universal Service Order clearly, repeatedly and unambiguously sets forth that carriers are to recover universal service contributions solely through rates for <u>interstate</u> services.<sup>2</sup> In fact, the Commission has claimed authority to require recovery in intrastate rates,<sup>3</sup> but it has repeatedly chosen not to exercise this authority.<sup>4</sup>

MCI claims that its federal Universal Service Fee, which is assessed through federal tariffs as a percentage charge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Universal Service Order at par. 809.("The third dimension to our inquiry is whether carriers may recover their contributions to the universal service support mechanisms through rates for interstate service or through a combination of rates for interstate and rates for intrastate services. ...[W]e conclude... we should maintain our traditional method of providing for recovery, which permits carriers to recover their federal universal service contributions through rates for interstate services only." (emphasis added)); par 831 ("assess contributions for mechanisms based solely on interstate revenues); pars. 824, 825, 838.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The Commission has noted that issue of its allowing recovery of contributions in intrastate rates is a matter which would have to be reviewed by the Joint Board. See, e.g., <u>Id.</u> at 824.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The issue of the Commission's jurisdiction to require carriers to seek recovery of universal service contributions in intrastate rates is currently being litigated in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. <u>Texas Office of Public Utility Counsel</u>, et. al. v. FCC, Case No. 97-60421.

on an interstate customer's intrastate and interstate usage, is in full compliance with the Commission's Universal Service Order as it is the "logical implication of the decision and is consistent with the Commission's rationale for determining the contribution base [interstate and intrastate revenues] for federal universal services."

The Commission seems to have anticipated this argument.

The Commission negated this "logical implication", distinguishing assessment of these contributions from recovery of these contributions:

"[W]hen assessing contributions based on intrastate and interstate revenues, the Commission is merely calculating a federal charge based on both interstate and intrastate revenues, which is distinct from regulating the rates and conditions of interstate service."

Further, the Commission specifically addressed carriers' recovery of these contributions:

"[W]e will provide for recovery of the entirety of these contributions via interstate mechanisms."

"[W]e have decided to <u>permit recovery</u> of contributions for the support mechanisms for eligible schools, libraries, and rural health care providers <u>solely via rates for interstate services</u>. Indeed, our rationale is even more compelling for the support mechanisms for eligible schools, libraries, and rural health care providers because those mechanisms will be supported based upon both intrastate and interstate revenues and,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> <u>Id</u>. at par. 821.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> <u>Id</u>. at par. 827.

therefore, there is a heightened concern that carriers would recover the portion of their intrastate contributions attributable to intrastate services through increases in rates for residential dial tone service, contrary to the affordability principles contained in section 254(b)(1). Therefore, carrier may recover these contributions solely through rates for interstate services.." (emphasis added)

There is no doubt that the Commission did not intend to permit carriers to recover, as proposed by MCI, universal service contributions from intrastate rates. The rule is clearly set forth in the Universal Service Order - recovery of contributions to the federal Universal Service program is limited to recovery through rates for interstate service. Therefore, MCI's attempt to recover its universal service contribution through rates not only for interstate usage, but for intrastate usage on a customer's interstate bill, is inconsistent with the Commission's order.

## MCI'S REQUEST IS UNTIMELY BECAUSE IT SEEKS RECONSIDERATION OF THE UNIVERSAL SERVICE ORDER.

The proceedings which resulted in the Universal Service
Order extended over more than one year's time, and provided
opportunities for public comment.8 Since the release of the

Universal Service Order at par. 838.

The proceeding culminating in the FCC's Universal Service Order, of May 8, 1997, began on March 8, 1996, when the Commission initiated a rulemaking to reform the system of universal service support pursuant to section 254 of the Telecommunications Act (Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order Establishing a Joint Board, CC Docket NO. 96-45, FCC 96-93 (Mar. 8 1996)).

Order, the FCC has addressed numerous petitions for reconsideration. Those petitions were filed within thirty days of the Commission's action, as required by statute. Although MCI claims that its petition is for a "Declaratory Ruling" , the May 8, 1997 Universal Service Order left no uncertainty. In effect, MCI seeks a change to the Universal Service Order that would have this Commission order that which the Commission expressly and repeatedly declined to do - provide carriers with authority to recover universal service contributions through intrastate rates. MCI's motion is an untimely petition for

On November 8, 1996, the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Services released a Recommended Decision. (Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Services, Recommended Decision, CC Docket NO. 96-45, FCC 96J-3 (Nov. 8, 1996)). On November 18, 1996, the Commission's Common Carrier Bureau issued a public notice seeking comment on the Joint Board's recommendations. (FCC Common Carrier Bureau Public Notice Seeking Comment on Universal Service Recommend Decision, DA 96-1981 (No. 18, 1996)). On May 8, 1997, the Commission released the Universal Service Order addressing the Joint-Board's recommendations.

<sup>9</sup> Most recently, the Commission issued the Fourth Order on Reconsideration, on December 30, 1997.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> 47 USC section 405(a), 47 CFR sections 1.101 - 1.106, 1.429.

A declaratory ruling is to terminate a controversy or remove an uncertainty. 47 CFR 1.2.

This action is similar to that brought by the Public Service Commission of Maryland in <u>Public Serv. Comm'n of Maryland</u>, 2 FCC Rcd 1998, 2002-2003 (1987). There the Common Carrier Bureau of the Commission denied Maryland's petition for a "declaratory ruling" on the grounds that, as it was not made within thirty days of the Commission's order, it was an untimely request for reconsideration.

reconsideration or, in the alternative, a request for a rule change, for which this is not the proper forum. 13

#### SECTION 152(B) OF THE COMMUNICATION ACT PROHIBITS THE COMMISSION FROM PERMITTING RATE RECOVERY BASED UPON INTRASTATE TELECOMMUNICATIONS USAGE.

MCI, by asking the Commission to allow it to apply a percentage charge to a customer's bill based upon a customer's intrastate and interstate usage, is, in effect, asking to implement an intrastate rate increase through an interstate tariff. There is no basis in law for granting the petition.

It is well settled that Section 152(b) removes intrastate matters from the FCC's reach. The Commission's universal service authority under Section 254 is not exempt from this jurisdictional limitation. In Louisiana PSC v. FCC, 476 US 355 (1986), the Supreme Court clarified that the jurisdictional fence of section 152(b) can only be overcome if Congress included "unambiguous" and "straightforward" language in the Act either modifying section 152(b) or expressly granting the FCC additional authority. Id. at 377. Section 254 provides no

In <u>CF Communications Corp. v. Century Telephone of Wisconsin, Inc., et. al.</u>, 10 FCC Rcd 9775, FCC 95-351 par. 20 (Sept. 6, 1995), the application sought a rule change, not a rule interpretation, and the FCC noted that it was bound to apply its rules. It is well-settled that a complaint proceeding is not the forum in which to change the Commission's rules. Rule changes are such matters that require the development of a factual record on which all interested members of the public, not just parties to the complaint, would have an opportunity to comment.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> See, 47 USC section 251(e)(1), 253, 276(b) and 276(c) where Congress clearly provides the Commission with exclusive authority. These provisions are to be considered with Section 254.

such unambiguous authority to permit a federal tariff to include rates for intrastate services. 15

In effect, MCI is asking the Commission to do, indirectly, that which it cannot do directly - establish jurisdiction with respect to rates "for or in connection with intrastate communications services." 47 USC 152(b). Recovery of contributions to the federal universal service program through a charge based on interstate and intrastate usage would infringe on state authority over intrastate telecommunications, in violation of 152(b). See, Louisiana, 476 US 355 (1986). The Commission lacks authority to increase intrastate rates, whether through a state or federal tariff.

Finally, MCI's petition seeks to raise an unnecessary controversy between the states and the Commission regarding the recovery for costs of the federal Universal Service Program. The Commission has wisely determined that it would work more cooperatively with the states on this issue, and we welcome that opportunity to work cooperatively on this very complex problem.

<sup>15</sup> As the Commission specifically allowed for recovery only in rates for interstate services, the issue of severability is moot.

#### CONCLUSION

For the reason stated, MCI's petition should be denied.

Lawrence G. Malone
Public Service Commission
of the State of New York
Three Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223-1350
(518) 474-2510

Of Counsel

Nancy Russell Assistant Counsel

Dated: June 17, 1998

Albany, New York

James Lanni
Rhode Island Division
of Public Utilities
100 Orange Street
Providence RI 02903

Joel B. Shifman Maine Public Utility Commission State House Station 18 Augusta ME 04865

Charles F. Larken
Vermont Department of
Public Service
120 State Street
Montpelier VT 05602

Rita Barmen Vermont Public Service Board 89 Main Street Montpelier VT 05602

Keikki Leesment New Jersey Board of Public Utilities 2 Gateway Center Newark NJ 07102 Veronica A. Smith
Deputy Chief Counsel
Pennsylvania Public Utility
Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg PA 17105-3265

Mary J. Sisak
District of Columbia
Public Service Commission
Suite 800
450 Fifth Street
Washington DC 20001

Telecommunications Report 1333 H Street, N.W. - 11th Floor West Tower Washington DC 20005

International Transcription Services, Inc. 2131 20th Street, NW Washington DC 20036 Brad Ramsay
NARUC
Interstate Commerce
Commission Bldg., Room 1102
12th & Constitution St., NW
Washington DC 20044

Magalie Roman Salas Secretary Federal Communications Commission Room 222 1919 M Street, NW Washington DC 20554 A. Richard Metzger, Chief Common Carrier Bureau Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Washington DC 20554

Camille Stonehill
State Telephone Regulation
Report
1101 King Street
Suite 444
Alexandria VA 22314

Alabama Public Service Commission 1 Court Square Suite 117 Montgomery AL 36104

Archie R. Hickerson Tennessee Public Service Commission 460 James Robertson Pky. Nashville TN 37219 Sandy Ibaugh Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission 901 State Office Bldg. Indianapolis IN 46204

Ronald Choura Michigan Public Service Commission 6545 Mercantile Way Lansing MI 48910 Mary Street
Iowa Utilities Board
Lucas Building
5th Floor
Des Moines IA 50316

Gary Evenson
Wisconsin Public
Service Commission
P.O. Box 7854
Madison WI 53707

Gordon L. Persinger Missouri Public Service Commission P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City MO 65102 Sam Loudenslager Arkansas Public Service Commission 1200 Center Street P.O. Box C-400 Little Rock AR 72203 Maribeth D. Swapp Deputy General Counsel Oklahoma Corp. Commission 400 Jim Thorpe Building Oklahoma City OK 73105

Marsha H. Smith
Idaho Public Utilities
Commission
Statehouse
Boise ID 83720

Edward Morrison
Oregon Public Utilities
Commission
Labor and Industries Bldg.
Room 330
Salem OR 97310

Mary Adu
Public Utilities Commission of the
State of California
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco CA 94102

Rob Vandiver
General Counsel
Florida Public Service
Commission
101 East Gaines Street
Tallahassee FL 32301

Glenn Blackmon Washington U&TC 1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr., S.W. P.O. Box 47250 Olympia WA 98504-7250 Policy and Planning Division Common Carrier Bureau Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W. - Room 544 Washington DC 20554

Myra Karegianes General Counsel Illinois Commerce Commission State of Illinois Building 160 No. LaSalle - Suite C-800 Chicago IL 60601-3104 Margie Hendrickson Assistant Attorney General Manager, Public Utilities Division 121 7th Place East, Suite 350 St. Paul MN 55101 Robin McHugh Montana PSC 1701 Prospect Avenue P.O. Box 202601 Helena MT 59620-2601 Cynthia Norwood Virginia State Corp. Commission P.O. Box 1197 Richmond VA 23201

Honorable Sharon L. Nelson Chairman Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission 1300 South Evergreen Park Dr., SW PO Box 47250 Olympia, WA 98504-7250 Ms. Sheryl Todd
Universal Service Branch
Accounts and Audits Division
Federal Communications Commission
2100 M Street, NW
8th Floor
Washington DC 20554

Diane Munns
Iowa Utilities Board
Lucas State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319

The Honorable William E. Kennard Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W. Room 814 Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Michael K. Powell Commissioner Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Room 844 Washington, DC 20554 The Honorable Susan Ness Commissioner Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Room 832 Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Gloria Tristani Commissioner Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Washington, DC 20554 The Honorable Harold Furchgott-Roth Commissioner Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Washington, DC 20554

Paul Misner
Senior Legal Advisor
Office of Commissioner FurchgottRoth
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554

John Nakahata
Office of the Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 814
Washington, DC 20554

James Casserly
Office of Commissioner Ness
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 832
Washington, DC 20554

Jane E. Mago Office of Commissioner Powell Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Room 844 Washington, DC 20554

Rick Chessen, Senior Legal Advisor Office of Commissioner Tristani Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Washington, DC 20554

Emily Hoffnar, Federal Staff Chair Accounting and Audits Division Universal Service Branch Federal Communications Commission 2100 M Street, NW Room 8617 Washington, DC 20554

Timothy Peterson
Deputy Division Chief
Accounting and Audits Division
Federal Communications Commission
2100 M Street, NW
Room 8613
Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Julia Johnson State Chair Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Gerald Gunther Building Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

The Honorable David Baker Commissioner Georgia Public Service Commission 244 Washington Street, SW Atlanta, GA 30334-5701 Philip F. McClelland Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate 1425 Strawberry Square Harrisburg, PA 17120 The Honorable Laska Schoenfelder Commissioner South Dakota Public Utilities Commission State Capitol 500 E. Capitol Street Pierre, SD 57501-5070 Martha S. Hogerty
Public Counsel for the State
of Missouri
301 West High Street
Suite 250
PO Box 7800
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Charles Bolle
South Dakota Public Utilities
Commission
State Capitol
500 E. Capitol Street
Pierre, SD 57501-5070

Deone Bruning
Nebraska Public Service Commission
300 The Atrium
1200 N Street
PO Box 94927
Lincoln, NE 68509-4927

Rowland Curry
Texas Public Utility Commission
1701 North Congress Avenue
PO Box 13326
Austin, TX 78701

Bridget Duff, Staff Chair Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0866

Sandra Makeeff
Iowa Utilities Board
Lucas State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319

Lori Kenyon Alaska Public Utilities Commission 1016 West Sixth Avenue Suite 400 Anchorage, AK 99501

Debra M. Kriete
Pennsylvania Public Utilities
Commission
Commonwealth and North Avenues
North Office Building
Room 110
PO Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Chairman
Maryland Public Service Commission
6 St. Paul Street
16th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21202-6806

Thor Nelson Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel 1580 Logan Street Suite 610 Denver, CO 80203 Barry Payne
Indiana Office of the
Consumer Counsel
100 North Senate Avenue
Room N501
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2208

Brian Roberts
California Public Utilities
Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Tiane Sommer Georgia Public Service Commission 244 Washington Street, SW Atlanta, GA 30334-5701